

PREPRINT: merci de citer d'après la version publiée: Stock, M. (2019). Inhabiting the city as tourist. Issues for urban and tourism theory. In: Frisch, T., Sommer, C., Stoltenberg, L. & Stors, N., *Tourism and Everyday life in the Contemporary City*, London, Routledge, pp.42-66

Inhabiting the city as tourist. Issues for urban and tourism theory

Mathis Stock

Introduction

The city as a place for tourists raises issues for urban and tourism theory. There seems to be a new awareness of scholars stemming from urban theory towards the phenomenon of tourism, which has not yet been prominently reflected on from the urban point of view. The contention that “effects of tourism on urban neighbourhoods will be quite difficult to distinguish from general processes of urban change and commodification” (Füller and Michel 2014, p. 1306) exemplifies this new perspective by looking into how tourist practices and urban development intertwine. This awareness contrasts with the affirmation, thirty years ago, by Ashworth (1989, p. 33): “A double neglect has occurred. Those interested in the study of tourism have tended to neglect the urban context in which much of it is set, while those interested in urban studies [...] have been equally neglectful of the importance of the tourist functions in cities”. This appropriation of knowledge is indeed necessary, for urban studies and tourism studies have only loosely been articulated for the last 100 years. Hence, there is an opportunity to think further, not only the relationship between tourism and the city, but more generally the complex relationships between the ‘touristic’ and the ‘urban’ on the one hand, and, on the other, the implications for tourism theory and urban theory.

Until now, tourism and urban theory have been evolving on parallel trajectories without much cross-fertilisation. Tourism has been approached by urban theory as ‘business as usual’ because it was seen as an economic activity that contributes to urban economy in a way similar to other ‘basic’ activities, lately within a cultural economy (Scott 2004). Only sparsely the specific quality of tourism as cultural and economic reworking of the city has been acknowledged (Judd and Fainstein 1999, Hoffman *et al.* 2003). Conversely, tourism theory has been developing an anti-urban bias because of the very definition of tourism as ‘flight from the cities’ seen as result of its density and overcrowding (Enzensberger 1958). Commentaries even highlight the apparent paradox of tourists fleeing the density of the city just to regroup in the densities of coastal resorts with all its urban problems (Krippendorf 1977). Textbooks categorise a specific ‘urban tourism’, distinguished from other forms of tourism (ecotourism, seaside tourism, mountain tourism, rural tourism), interpreted as opposed to the urban (Williams and Shaw 2004). By doing so, tourism theory implies urban qualities and urban values of tourism only come into effect in cities, a claim that neglects the inherent urbanisation processes of every single tourist development and tourist practice. Tourism as an urban practice raises questions beyond traditional reflections on ‘urban tourism’, but rarely scholars have tried to move beyond the obvious city–tourism nexus.¹ Therefore, it is questionable if the term ‘urban tourism’ is helpful to this respect, and there is a need to think more generally about the linkage between urbanisation processes and touristification processes.

In this contribution, I propose a discussion and conceptual insights about the conflictual ways tourists inhabit cities. It necessitates a renewed understanding of tourists as temporary inhabitants who mobilise competences and rights, and allow for an account of differentiated ways of practicing cities as tourists. It is expected the debate and conceptual renewal will allow a better understanding of how and why metropolises have become major tourism spaces, how tourist activities insert themselves in

PREPRINT: merci de citer d'après la version publiée: Stock, M. (2019). Inhabiting the city as tourist. Issues for urban and tourism theory. In: Frisch, T., Sommer, C., Stoltenberg, L. & Stors, N., *Tourism and Everyday life in the Contemporary City*, London, Routledge, pp.42-66

the cities, and how new conflicts between tourists and residents are crucial yet ambivalent components of contemporary cities.

The contemporary situation is indeed a conflictual one, where on the one hand a set of actors foster an ever more important number of tourists in cities and on the other hand, anti-tourism movements in cities develop. The growing importance of tourism in metropolises and what is known as 'tourist-historic cities' (Ashworth and Tunbridge 1990) is one of the key elements of urban development in what could be called a 'recreational turn' of European cities (Stock 2007c). Generally, European cities in the last forty years—from 1980 to 2018—have tripled the production of bednights, and thus the overall economic importance for cities.ⁱⁱ According to Eurostat (2016), cities (towns and suburbs included, only rural areas excluded) in Europe count for 66% of the 2.68 billion bednights spent in 2016, i.e., about 1.8 billion of bed nights. Political support at all levels, from the local to the global scale, including the European level has been key, thus exemplifying the multi-level governance of tourism. For instance, in its charter of global tourism, the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO 2012, p. 48) is pro-urban tourism:

"Tourism is a key resource for cities and local residents. The future development of cities [...] will demand policies that take into account cities' economic, social and environmental stability while at the same time offering the best experience for visitors. [...]. Tourism needs the diverse and flexible products a city can offer and cities need tourism to achieve their social and economic objectives".

This significance of the economic activity mirrors the remarkable change of the cultural value assigned to the city. Urbanophobic views on moral grounds have long been pervasive for Western cities (Salomon-Calvin and Marchand 2011) and the recoding of the city as a desirable place for tourists can be seen as a significant cultural change. Today, the symbolic capital of cities is informed by touristic values, and the attraction of cities as tourist places is at its peak. Ironically, this concerns also those cities that have been described as cities in decline throughout the 1990s. Indeed, Harvey (2001, p. 405) conceives of a

"collective symbolic capital which attaches to names and places like Paris, Athens, New York, Rio de Janeiro, Berlin and Rome is of great import and gives such places great economic advantages relative to, say, Baltimore, Liverpool, Essen, Lille, Glasgow. The problem for these latter places is to raise their quotient of symbolic capital and to increase their mark of distinction to better ground their claims to the uniqueness that yields monopoly rent".

Twenty years on, these places have all made bids for the European Capital of Culture, thus positioning themselves in the global tourism field.ⁱⁱⁱ It leads to the understanding of the contemporary city as genuinely constituted by tourism, and allows to rethink the city as a place inhabited by mobile and temporary inhabitants, including tourists. Yet, after at least twenty years of pro-growth policies, tourism is acknowledged as contradictory and ambivalent development for cities, both because of increasing number of tourists and because of the fact tourism is no longer concentrated in traditional central tourist districts, but spreads out in virtually every neighbourhood. A first argument evokes 'congestion' and 'carrying capacity', which are terms of classical tourism theory. The following Eurostat statement relates clearly to Krippendorf's (1977) idea of the 'Landschaftsfresser', i.e., tourists who destroy the very landscape they come to gaze at, and Butlers (1980) decline of tourist areas because of the saturation threshold of a 'carrying capacity':

"However, in keeping with many aspects of urban development, tourism is a paradox, insofar as an increasing number of tourists in some towns and cities has resulted in congestion/saturation which may damage the atmosphere and local culture that made them attractive in the first place [...]. Furthermore, while tourism has the potential to

PREPRINT: merci de citer d'après la version publiée: Stock, M. (2019). Inhabiting the city as tourist. Issues for urban and tourism theory. In: Frisch, T., Sommer, C., Stoltenberg, L. & Stors, N., *Tourism and Everyday life in the Contemporary City*, London, Routledge, pp.42-66

generate income which may be used to redevelop/regenerate urban areas, an influx of tourists can potentially lower the quality of life for local inhabitants, for example, through: higher levels of pollution and congestion; new retail formats replacing traditional commerce; increased prices; or increased noise. Venezia (Italy) and Barcelona (Spain) are two of the most documented examples of such issues” (Eurostat 2016, p.138).

A second string of arguments relates to the discussion around *new urban tourism* (Füller and Michel 2014, Stors *et al.*, this volume, Ch. 1). It concerns the unprecedented link between tourism and the housing market, the touristic gentrification of cities, the appropriation of inhabited space, the spreading of tourist activities in residential neighbourhoods, and thus the conflictual encounter between tourists and residents. We might want to be cautious to approach it necessarily as ‘new’ since the quest for authenticity as preferred to pre-formatted tourist attractions is co-constitutive of tourism (MacCannell 1976). The fascination for the ‘local’ has long been constitutive of tourist practices. It leads nevertheless to new questions: Who has the right to the city? Are spaces appropriated by tourists at the expense to residents? Are residents evicted by tourists? How to regulate tourism in a way the city stays inhabitable for everyone?

This chapter is structured around three sections. The first section outlines the difficulties when approaching *new urban tourism*. I identify the challenge of the statistical categories cities use to quantify tourists, but also the category of ‘urban tourism’. Moreover, the link between tourism and the everyday life at the heart of *new urban tourism*, raises interesting questions since new practices and new mobilities arise that are posited within practice theory (Larsen, this volume, Ch. 2). I shall argue the use of the ‘everyday’ as the central category in practice theory shadows other theoretical possibilities. The playful and non-routinised character of practices is underestimated. The second section follows on this central thesis and points out how one specific theoretical framework, that of ‘dwelling’, can be reformulated in order to better understand the ways tourists practice the city: Firstly, by approaching them as temporary inhabitants of the city; secondly, by conceiving them as engaging with the city thanks to spatial competences and spatial capital. The concept of ‘dwelling’ is used as overall category, related to phenomenological theory, whereas the concepts of inhabiting and inhabitants will allow for the description of various forms of engaging with spatiality. The third section will show how the tourist as inhabitant of the city bears rights to mobility and the city, which lie at the heart of conflicting narratives. A cosmopolitanist view of the freedom of mobility conflicts with the freedom of immobility. As this reflection is part of a larger project to articulate urban and tourism theory, the conclusion expands from the city to other kinds of urbanisation and touristification processes.

Contemporary tourism in question: from extra-ordinary to ordinary practice?

Tourism is a word applied as moral category because of the conflicting values it conveys: The ‘bad’ tourist against the ‘good’ traveller; the ‘bad’ tourist against the ‘good’ local; but also the ‘good’ civilised tourist against the un-civilised ‘local’ (Urbain 1991, Equipe MIT 2002). The urban conflicts around tourism translates also a moral struggle, where tourists are categorised as invaders: ‘Tourist you are the terrorist’ reads a sign in Barcelona. It is therefore a challenging task to understand the changing position of tourists within contemporary societies (see also Grube, this volume, Ch. 11). Therefore, what does ‘tourism’ mean in a societal context defined by the pervasiveness of mobility, digitality and urbanity? Has tourism become a routinised everyday practice, in contrast to 19th and 20th century tourism regimes? Tourism as practice is not the only element to consider, for it is also a legal, statistical and moral category that affects the ways the ‘regime of value’ of tourism is constructed.^{iv}

PREPRINT: merci de citer d'après la version publiée: Stock, M. (2019). Inhabiting the city as tourist. Issues for urban and tourism theory. In: Frisch, T., Sommer, C., Stoltenberg, L. & Stors, N., *Tourism and Everyday life in the Contemporary City*, London, Routledge, pp.42-66

The pervasiveness of tourism, especially, in the contemporary urban world is a problem for urban studies. Contemporary urban places—be it cities, metropolises, city-regions or resorts—are today co-constituted by tourism. Virtually no place is left without the presence of tourism imaginations, practices, tourists. The ‘planetary urbanisation’ (Lefebvre 2000) is coupled with the ‘planetary touristification’, i.e., the globalisation of tourism between 1800 and 2000 (Antonescu and Stock 2014). To this respect, tourism has become literally ordinary because of its pervasiveness that contrasts with earlier patterns of concentration. New practices also challenge the traditional definition of tourism, especially second homes and new leisure mobilities, which expand spatially the everyday life to places inaccessible before. For instance, Larsen *et al.* (2007) show how various mobilities related to events that have nothing to do with tourism at first glance (such as visiting a friend, organising a family reunion, wedding parties) have nonetheless touristic dimensions, because of the specific locations chosen and the various touristic activities coupled with family duties. The touristic interpretation of the world is decisive in the transformation of the once separated dedicated practice into a practice that can be interwoven with any kind of practice.

Therefore, new tensions for the definition of tourism arise, which will be considered in the two sections that follow. Tourism as category is challenged by the problem of general mobility and raises the question of specificity of tourism as form of mobility, but also the category of ‘urban tourism’ is more problematic than it appears *prima facie*. A second element relates to the examination of the theoretical effect of practice theory on tourism studies, which construes tourism as ‘everyday’ practice.

Tourism as problematic category for late-modern societies

Tourism is a statistical category with many subtleties not easy to grasp (Spode 2016). From an international point of view, the tourist is opposed to the migrant on the basis of the length of stay. Implemented in the 1930s by the International Institute of Statistics, both are seen as mobility, but tourism is seen as a temporary mobility. In order to tackle the highly differentiated contemporary mobilities, statistics is left only with a binary classification—migration/tourism—reductionist in its very conception. A tourist is a person who travels for less than a year for every thinkable purpose—ranging from work to pilgrimage—and who is not a migrant (UNWTO 2016). As a consequence, the global statistics on tourism is flawed: Tourism is no longer accounted for as a meaningful practice of leisure elsewhere or ‘travel for travel purposes’ as develops tourism theory since the 1940s (Spode 2009, Darbellay and Stock 2012), but is inflated by the account of people who move for work (ranging from traditional business travel to conferences, meetings, events), for maintaining sociality and family ties, for health reasons or religious purposes. On the other hand, these global statistics do not take into account domestic tourism. A rough estimate would probably apply to the 2015 mark of 1,3 billion international arrivals a ten-fold multiplier in order to be more adequate.

Moreover, cities posit themselves from the point of view of the production of bednights, one of the key indicators for global benchmarking, which is pervasively used to position the city within the global field of tourism. There is a need for a critical approach to tourism statistics. For instance, Berlin is proud of its more than 30 million bed nights in 2017, which is used for marketing purposes; yet, this figure does only refer to commercial accommodations in establishments with more than 10 beds, which neglects shared accommodations, smaller pensions, or non-commoditised beds, such as second homes, friends, family. For *new urban tourism* relies heavily on alternative forms of sojourn beyond the strict definition of the tourism market, such as Couchsurfing (www.couchsurfing.com) and home sharing, it is not accounted for in tourism statistics.^v It also has the usual shortcomings of counting

PREPRINT: merci de citer d'après la version publiée: Stock, M. (2019). Inhabiting the city as tourist. Issues for urban and tourism theory. In: Frisch, T., Sommer, C., Stoltenberg, L. & Stors, N., *Tourism and Everyday life in the Contemporary City*, London, Routledge, pp.42-66

bednights in general, whereas the touristic purpose cannot be traced since hotel rooms can be used for multiple purposes. Since it makes a socio-cultural difference if people go on holiday or work, on family, education, leisure or health issues, the official statistics raises questions of interpretation in the context of anti-tourism movements and benchmarking. Does the quantification of increasing bednights really mean increasing tourism or does it rather mean an increase of overall mobility for various individual projects? There is a need to unpack and very carefully acknowledge the limitations of the definitions official statistics use in order to adequately interpret *new urban tourism*.^{vi}

There is also a theoretical issue for urban theory and for tourism theory raised by the very expression 'urban tourism'. It contributes to the confusion, if used to specify tourism or to distinguish specific geographic milieus. As Ashworth and Page (2011, p. 2) state: "Adding the adjective urban to the noun tourism locates an activity in a spatial context but does not in itself define or delimit that activity". However, even this contention is problematic since 'planetary urbanisation' (Lefebvre 2000, Brenner and Schmid 2014) diffuses the urban pervasively. Could we distinguish 'non-urban' forms of tourism in an age of planetary urbanisation? If 'urban' refers to a specific territorial form called 'city' in contrast to a 'countryside', then the location in a specific spatial context could make sense. Yet, the contemporary urban continuum between hyper-centralised urban quarters in the global city and sparsely urbanised countryside would call for a more careful approach of the urban.^{vii}

Moreover, tourism is historically identified with an urban culture: Urbanites going on holiday is a 19th century phenomenon where urban norms and values are performed (Löfgren 1999). Tourism can be approached as a specific situation, where urban cultures are produced and reproduced. It relates to an 'urban praxis' because of urban norms and values the tourists as urbanites carry with them. Lefebvre (1968, p. 120) states: "Urbanites carry the urban with them although they do not bring urbanity".^{viii} For example, the national parks movement in the USA from the 1860s on can be interpreted as a tourist gaze performed by the urbanites of the cities of the US American East Coast, which estheticises nature as 'wilderness' to be protected. Likewise, the European Alps have been developing as 'playground of Europe'—an appellation forged by mountaineer and president of the Alpine Club Leslie Stephen (1871)—for urbanites at least from the beginning of the 19th century on. The multiple encodings, imaginaries, interpretations of place as exotic from the urban point of view is not only a problem of modernity, but specifically a relationship Western urbanites engage with the world.^{ix}

This 'urbanisation of consciousness' (Harvey 1985) plays out in tourism in a specific way as the transfer of urbanity from the metropolises and cities to the resorts (Stock and Lucas 2012). Urbanisation through tourism took place from the 1800s on: Seaside resorts and mountain resorts emerged as urban places. Therefore, resorts—not only cities—can be seen as urban environments where tourism unfolds. This is consistent with Lefebvre's (2000) urban theory, where the urban revolution of the industrial city redistributes urbanity^x on other scales: The urbanisation of the seaside through the building of resorts is one of the examples. Empirically, it can be shown through the urban forms of resorts (architecture, density, services, amenities), for example in Montreux (Switzerland), Brighton (England), Scarborough (England), Atlantic City (USA), Cannes (France), all of them emerging in the 19th century. That is why there is a reworking of tourism and urban theory at stake, which would be able to take into account the touristic dimensions of the urban continuum instead of focusing through the expression 'urban tourism' only on cities. It would also dwell on the urban dimensions of tourism, allowing for an intelligibility of how urban imaginaries, values and practices inform tourism and the urban dimensions of tourist places.

PREPRINT: merci de citer d'après la version publiée: Stock, M. (2019). Inhabiting the city as tourist. Issues for urban and tourism theory. In: Frisch, T., Sommer, C., Stoltenberg, L. & Stors, N., *Tourism and Everyday life in the Contemporary City*, London, Routledge, pp.42-66

Tourism as 'everyday' activity: the theoretical effect of practice theory

In social science, a 'practice turn' (Schatzki *et al.* 2001) has occurred, underscoring the idea that every single element of human societies is seen as constituted by practice. As Reckwitz (2002, p. 249) explains: Practice is "a routinised type of behaviour which consists of several elements, interconnected to one another: forms of bodily activities, forms of mental activities, 'things' and their use, a background knowledge in the form of understanding, know-how, states of emotion and motivational knowledge". From a theoretical point of view, practice theory and its framing of tourism as routinised behaviour is challenging the concept of tourism as contrary to the everyday world as in the notion 'Gegenwelt' (anti-world) (Hennig 1999) or 'elsewhereland' (Löfgren 1999). Several arguments sustain this challenge: Tourist practices necessitate elements of everyday life such as sleeping, eating, caring for children, or the continuity of family life (Franklin and Crang 2001, Crang 2002).^{xi} Moreover, tourism is seen as a routine where the 'corporeal hexis' of the tourist (i.e., the routines inscribed in the body) can be analysed (Edensor 2000). A step towards 'de-exotising tourism' (Larsen *et al.* 2007) in the sense of integrating touristic elements into everyday mobilities has been taken. As a theoretical effect, the use of practice theory that defines practice as set of routinised 'everyday' behaviour construes tourism as an everyday practice, defined by routines, habitus, pre-reflexive action and corporeal *hexis*.

However, this theoretical stance has to be critically reflected: What is gained, what is lost for a congruent interpretation of contemporary tourism when proceeding in that way? First, can we really use the notion of 'habitus' for practices that take place in extra-quotidian spaces and times, and which require a certain amount of preparation? Going on holiday is typically an activity where reading guidebooks, imagining destinations, making reservations prior to the travel occur. There are even models insisting on the three key moments in holiday: Before, during, after holidays that all combine the activity of holiday-making (Grabum 2002). Routines and pre-reflexive are combined with moments of reflexivity and preparation.

Secondly, the very notion of 'everyday' is to be examined critically, because the lifeworld of late-modern individuals is not only constituted by routinised practices, but also by breaking of routines and the contestation of the programmed activities.^{xii} They have been called 'deroutinising' practices and occur during leisure time on a 'spectrum of leisure', a continuum ranging from heavily routinised to deroutinised practices (Elias 1986). Holidays are posited as means of allowing a time-space for deroutinised activities like heavy drinking, non-routinised sexual intercourse, specific sports activities, and play. The notion of play is particularly posited as distinguished to the everyday. Within a theory of play, Caillois (1958) distinguishes four categories of play—*illynx*, *mimesis*, *agon*, *alea*—which are mobilised within tourism theory as deroutinising activities (see also Equipe MIT 2002). Moreover, we could argue every single element—even basic human activities such as eating, sleeping, drinking, body care, sexuality—is assigned a new 'touristified' sense because of the specific context and situation. The changing context modifies the signification of practice, which bears a truly relational definition of tourism. Pott (2007) makes this clear from a systems theoretical point of view with his claim of a 'code' within tourist practices, which sees elements as 'exciting' in a tourist situation where it would be boring in an everyday situation. For instance, the traffic, noise or hustle of the metropolis is coded as exciting within a touristic situation whereas it is coded as problematic in everyday situation.

Therefore, I suggest the concept 'practice' is useful also if including 'non-routinised activities', where habitus formations do not necessarily apply. It would open up Bourdieu-style practice theory and allow for an approach of practices as switching between routinised and deroutinising activities. It

PREPRINT: merci de citer d'après la version publiée: Stock, M. (2019). Inhabiting the city as tourist. Issues for urban and tourism theory. In: Frisch, T., Sommer, C., Stoltenberg, L. & Stors, N., *Tourism and Everyday life in the Contemporary City*, London, Routledge, pp.42-66

would also allow for an incorporation of two distinctive patterns of spatiality, home and away, which contribute to make sense to the practices. Tourism remains therefore framed as non-ordinary practice because of a specific relation to place, where a coding as recreation is combined with the coding of place as 'other place'. In order to take into account this specific spatiality and the productive element of the spatial context, I suggest to go even one step further. From a geographical point of view, the 'arts of doing' (Certeau 1980) are identified as coping with space and making do with spatiality (Lussault and Stock 2010). This allows for framing of what people do as tourists as *inhabiting*, i.e., establishing a specific relationship with place. Since tourism is about a specific interpretation and assigning a specific meaning to place, it is distinguished from other ways of inhabiting the city.

Inhabiting the city as a tourist

The 'city' can be approached as inhabited space. The commitment of individuals, the diverse, and multiple ways of practising the city constitute the qualities of contemporary urban space. "Urban life suggests meetings, the confrontation of differences, reciprocal knowledge and acknowledgement (including ideological and political confrontation) ways of living, 'patterns' which coexist in the city" (Lefebvre 1996, p. 75). Therefore, analysing the city as inhabited space requires the reconstruction of the very differentiated projects people form with the city and the very differentiated ways people inhabit the city. In urban theory, the city is conceived of as specific place because "the city creates a situation where distance between things doesn't exist anymore" (Schmid 2006, p. 167). This means people inhabit the city by taking advantage of this annihilation of distance, since societal diversity is made accessible in *one* place. Tourists are now an integral part of the city as inhabited space. They develop a specific way of inhabiting the city, which co-constitute the city-space.

In order to understand the city as inhabited space for very differentiated place projects, a theory of dwelling could guide empirical investigations. 'Dwelling' signifies here the overall category, whereas 'inhabiting' points towards the differentiated ways individuals practice places. It aims at an understanding of the ways people inhabit the city touristically, the expression mirroring the German poet Hölderlin's verse 'poetically Man inhabits the Earth' (2008). Heidegger (2004a; 2004b) took this on to define dwelling as 'ways of being on Earth', as relationship to place defined by proximity (*Nähe*) and de-distanciation (*Ent-fernung*).^{xiii} It is used in phenomenological geography in order to think the attachment to place, and the spatiality of the human being,^{xiv} but also to understand inhabited space (or place) and not abstract space as the object of geographical research. Heidegger did not think of tourists in his theory of dwelling, but an interesting shift in the understanding of current tourist practices could occur if one accepted tourists could be framed as 'inhabitants', that is, as humans developing a specific touristic relationship to places they practice.

There have been attempts to approach tourism as dwelling within a narrow Heideggerian conception where the creation of proximity is central (Obrador 2003). It acknowledges the symbolic appropriation of place by tourists, the constitution of familiarity and insideness by tourists and the inclusion of place as meaningful for tourists (see also Wildish and Spierings, this volume, Ch. 7). Yet, despite this being a first step, this conception underestimates the very sense of place as distant from the everyday life and needing adjustment, not routines and familiarity. The conceptualisation of 'dwelling' as proximity and excluding mobile lifeforms from it does not do justice to forms of inhabiting where mobility is key and needs to be expanded to all forms of individuals' spatiality.^{xv} The idea of 'dwelling in motion' (Hannam *et al.* 2006) points in this direction by insisting on the different ways mobility is creatively appropriated by individuals. More generally, individuals inhabit in mobile and immobile ways; mobility is just a part and expression of dwelling, but is not opposed

PREPRINT: merci de citer d'après la version publiée: Stock, M. (2019). Inhabiting the city as tourist. Issues for urban and tourism theory. In: Frisch, T., Sommer, C., Stoltenberg, L. & Stors, N., *Tourism and Everyday life in the Contemporary City*, London, Routledge, pp.42-66

to it. Delineating the concept of dwelling as coping with spatiality would allow for the recognition of individual dwelling styles, more or less informed by mobility (Stock 2009). Inhabiting the city would therefore be only one element among a multitude of places and displacements.

'Inhabiting touristically' within individual systems of mobility comes therefore into the focus. Touristic practices are approached as one way of inhabiting places and can be framed as specific practices where spatial issues are essential. It allows for a conceptual rearrangement: Rather than conceived as 'being' as in traditional phenomenological theory, inhabiting is about 'doing', more precisely as 'make do' with spatiality (Lussault and Stock 2010). I will therefore argue towards the conception of tourists as temporary inhabitants of tourist places, and insist on spatial competences and a 'spatial capital' necessary to practice the city as tourists.

Humans as temporary inhabitants of places

Tourists as temporary inhabitants of cities can be integrated in a larger framework of contemporary geographical conditions: The relatively higher degree of mobility expresses a post-sedentary world where inhabitants are mobile. That leads to a theoretical perspective of dwelling in which the practices of residing or sheltering do not summarise the question of dwelling, but are rather one aspect of it. For example, touristic practices contribute also to the dwelling of individuals through the creation of place-relations, an experience of places and movements, and the coping with specific places (Stock 2015).

Several elements are important for the conception of tourists as temporary inhabitants of the city, thus extending the notion of 'dwelling' to all kinds of meaningful relationships to place. We have to consider the contemporary human beings as temporary inhabitants, thus integrating the presence/absence patterns and the mobility component in the analysis. That means individuals practice places temporarily, even the residence is not a permanent home despite the legal claims. It would be one step further because Heidegger and much of phenomenological geography develop a perspective of immobile human beings, being attached to one place in an authentic way.^{xvi} In addition, individuals develop specific modes of inhabiting, i.e., specific relationship to place according to the intentionality with which they practice space.^{xvii} Touristic practice can be interpreted as a specific mode of inhabiting, where place is practiced through a recreational intentionality, and where place is interpreted as place of otherness (see also Parish, . Tourists inhabit cities not as ordinary citizens but informed by a touristic interpretation of the world. If inhabiting means developing a sense of place and a meaningful practice of place, then we can contend late-modern societies develop specific meaningful practices of place where mobilities, and specifically, tourist mobilities are the essential elements.

This argument of tourism as 'mode of inhabiting' would also counter the expression 'tourism at home' with the idea of the 'tourist gaze' as a gaze on the extraordinary and the contrast to everyday situations can apply everywhere, even at home (Jeuring and Haartsen 2016). This would happen through abstraction of the familiar and the construction of the unusual. Against this vision, two points can be posited: It is an illusion to see the resident and the tourist as equivalent category of inhabitants when visiting the city because of a different mastering of the urban space. For the former, the urban space is experienced as a familiar space where different spatial problems (such as orientation, accessibility through transport, knowledge) are mastered. For the latter, the urban space is experienced as a space of otherness, where even the most mundane elements (such as food, drink, public transport, traffic) are elements of excitement (Stoltenberg and Frisch, this volume, Ch. 8). The occasional gaze on the extraordinary cannot be used as criteria that transforms a resident into a tourist;

PREPRINT: merci de citer d'après la version publiée: Stock, M. (2019). Inhabiting the city as tourist. Issues for urban and tourism theory. In: Frisch, T., Sommer, C., Stoltenberg, L. & Stors, N., *Tourism and Everyday life in the Contemporary City*, London, Routledge, pp.42-66

rather a 'mode of inhabiting' (Stock 2014), i.e., a relationship to place maintained for the duration of the touristic situation, in which otherness is key. *Inhabiting* place in a certain way, i.e., combining the code of recreation with the construction of place as other place, is therefore the essential element in the definition of tourism, not a specific practice like going to a museum or visiting a formerly unknown or less known neighbourhood during a guided tour. The key argument is that familiarity with the city as a whole, where people know the codes, the transport system, the language, the national habitus, the food, you sleep at home, etc., is the primordial relationship to place. Inhabiting a 'here', which contrasts with the 'elsewhere' inhabited by tourists. Therefore, the way of inhabiting the city is different from the way a tourist inhabits the city.

Instead of conceiving the concept of dwelling as a relationship to *one* place—be it the residence, the neighbourhood, or the city—the relationship to *multiple* places and mobilities are to be considered. It opens up for the study of individual systems of placement/dis-placement on the one hand, and the relationship with different spatial problems under scrutiny on the other. It could also be an answer to the questions the 'mobilities turn' (Sheller and Urry 2006) raises for social sciences. It argues in favour of unpacking the multiple practices of mobility, but is still in search of a sound theoretical base. Inhabiting defined as coping with spatiality, i.e., the multiple spatial problems such as distance, location, limits, scale, territory raise for in the lifeworlds, could lead towards such as perspective. Mobilities would not be seen as opposed to inhabiting, but would be framed as one element of 'dwelling styles'. It would help not to focus on specific types of mobility, but define differentiated individual systems of places and movements, which are more or less informed by mobility.

Towards a 'spatial capital' of mobile inhabitants?

Tourists inhabit the city and in order to do so, they develop specific competences, follow norms and have rights, are equipped with technical instruments and imaginations (Stock 2015). As cities are places of otherness for the tourists, the spatial problems the latter face are different from those of residents. Therefore, tourists develop spatial competences and mobilise a specific spatial capital. The work on spatial competences and spatial capital is a distinctive feature of francophone geography. The question of the differential capacities of individuals regarding the control of their spatiality has been theoretically explored by numerous authors (Lévy 1999, Lussault 2007, Lussault and Stock 2010). It is related to Bourdieu's (1994, 2000) model of agency where agents engage their social, economic, cultural, technological capital in order to achieve objectives within a specific social field.

The concept of capital has proven fruitful to address the question of accumulation and disposition of capacities individuals put into play, which gives them power over situations and advantages towards other agents. Within geography, Lévy (1999, 2003) develops the idea of a 'spatial capital', understood as disposition of individuals to engage with spatial problems, especially distance. He defines it as "ensemble of resources accumulated by an actor, which allows him/her taking advantage of the use of the spatial dimension of society, following his/her strategy" (Lévy 2003, p. 124).^{xviii} It includes the control over distance metrics. I.e. mobility and accessibility as a fundamental element, more recently explored as 'mobility capital' by Kaufmann *et al.* (2004); location of residence (in the centre or in the suburbs) or memorised experiences of cities also contribute to differentiating the spatial capital of individuals.

In order to make clear the practice-centred spatialities, I will focus on specific spatial competences of tourists. In geography, despite the practice and performance turn, we still lack studies focussing on the competences and skills related to the spatial problems individuals face when constituting their lifeworld. Particularly necessary are the relational definitions of competences.^{xix} Michel Lussault

PREPRINT: merci de citer d'après la version publiée: Stock, M. (2019). Inhabiting the city as tourist. Issues for urban and tourism theory. In: Frisch, T., Sommer, C., Stoltenberg, L. & Stors, N., *Tourism and Everyday life in the Contemporary City*, London, Routledge, pp.42-66

(2007) proposes to focus on 'elementary spatial competences' of humans, such as: (1) placement defined as the capacity of occupying the adequate place for an activity; (2) scaling defined as the identification of adequate scales for an activity; (3) mastery of metrics defined as capacity of the use of adequate means of transport; (4) delimitation as capacity of drawing limits according to a situation; (5) crossing defined as the capacity to cross spatial limits and multiple forms of territory; and (6) navigating defined as specific capacity of designing adequate routes. This could be mobilised in order to approach touristic practices. Lucas (2018) translates this idea of elementary spatial competences into a study of tourists' practice of Los Angeles, where the competences of way finding, delimitation of tourist spaces, identification of centres and the location of the body are the issue. It opens up for a situational understanding of tourist practices, where human actors are tested particularly in relation to space and have to make do with space.^{xx} It leads to the conclusion tourists mobilise their perceptive, cognitive, linguistic, technological and relational competences. The tourist is conceptualised not as a 'cultural dope' but as an actor with spatial skills, inhabiting the city equipped with the tourist gaze.

This is particularly important for what is called 'repeaters' in city tourism (Freitag 2010) for their knowledge and skills differ from one-time tourists. According to their past experiences of cities, they cope more or less smoothly with centrality, transports, public space.^{xxi} Yet, these capacities of inhabiting the city as tourist are unequal: The elementary spatial competences are seen as expressions of different modalities of spatial capital.

Co-inhabiting: whose right to the city?

The massive inhabitation of cities by tourists raises the question of the right to the city. A city is *per definitionem* a place where multiple forms of inhabiting occurs. In an era where mobility is a key element of so-called 'late-modern' societies, the city is precisely characterised by the various and conflicting projects people engage with the city, be it on a temporary or a more or less permanent basis. In this sense, it is important to focus on the co-inhabiting of the city based on very different practices and intentionalities. In the light of the contemporary conflicts around the city around 'overtourism', social movements claim a 'right to the city', such as in Berlin or Hamburg (Novy and Colomb 2012). It touches on the relationship between residents fighting against appropriation of urban space by tourists. This can be seen as a historical moment because cities have been 'dressed up' for tourists for at least the last 100 years. This movement of touristification has been intensifying since the 1980s as a corollary of deindustrialisation, and even more since the global financial crisis in 2008 as significant element of the urban economy (Pratt and Hutton 2013). Although tourism and the urban economy have been intertwined for the last 200 years, it is a new phenomenon because the impact on gentrification has been less important.^{xxii} Conflicts relate to the use of short-let holiday apartments (Airbnb style) leading to rising rents and cost of living, but also around the use of public space of dominantly residential neighbourhoods for partying, alcohol misuse, creating noise (Colomb and Novy 2017). In contrast, previous conflicts of tourism in the city were seen as crowding around tourism attractions, and had not the potential of disrupting the residents' way of life.

Do we have conceptual tools in order to understand this problem? Is it the translation of the class struggle into urban space or even a struggle *for place* between tourists and residents?^{xxiii} I shall try here to discuss and mobilise the Lefebvrian notion of the 'right to the city' and 'right to centrality' in order to raise the question of the legitimate presence of tourists in the city. Integrated in a theory of production of space, where material and immaterial elements are focused on, it is defined as "a transformed and renewed right to urban life" (Lefebvre 1996, p. 158). The right to the city is designed to further the interests "of the whole society and firstly of all those who *inhabit*" (Lefebvre, 1996, p.

PREPRINT: merci de citer d'après la version publiée: Stock, M. (2019). Inhabiting the city as tourist. Issues for urban and tourism theory. In: Frisch, T., Sommer, C., Stoltenberg, L. & Stors, N., *Tourism and Everyday life in the Contemporary City*, London, Routledge, pp.42-66

158, my emphasis). I shall try here to link the question of inhabiting to that of the right to the city by examining how mobile individuals inhabit the city and claiming rights to centrality and mobility.

Inhabiting and the rights to centrality

Lefebvre (1968) uses the concept of inhabiting to designate the urban inhabitants in contrast to the citizen of a nation-state. The idea of framing the tourist as inhabitant runs counter Lefebvre's intentions. First, because tourists are not considered as inhabitants by Lefebvre; inhabitants are only those who reside in the city or the outskirts (*banlieusards*); even the global elite, says Lefebvre (1968), does not inhabit, but floats around the globe. Second, Lefebvre is used in a critical way to oppose the tourism industry, in which are embedded the tourists and to argue in favour of the residents. The right to the city is seen as rights of residents to their own city in order to oppose to the governance of the powerful few in a neoliberal city, where gentrification processes go on because of tourism (Novy and Colomb 2012, Colomb and Novy 2017, Gravari-Barbas and Guinand, 2017, Frenzel, this volume, Ch. 4, Parish, this volume, Ch. 5).

The concept of the right to the city is designed by Lefebvre to underline the risk of exclusion of people from the city and encompasses

“on the one hand, the right of users to make known their ideas on the space and time of their activities in the urban area. It would, however, also cover the right to the use of the centre, a privileged place, instead of being dispersed and stuck into ghettos (for workers, immigrants, the ‘marginal’ and even for the ‘privileged’)” (Lefebvre 1996, p. 34).

Commentators rightly point towards the “right to command the whole urban process” (Harvey 2008, p. 28), the power of decision-making on urban development, and the appropriation of urban space for the inhabitants, not only for the elite.

In applying the concept not to the immobile city dweller, but to the mobile contemporary individual who inhabits a multiplicity of places temporarily, inhabiting the city as a tourist is also framed as a legitimate spatial action, and therefore can be seen as a ‘right to centrality’. Indeed, where is the (middle class) tourists’ residence situated, which defines one of the elements of their spatial capital? In the city centre or in the peri-central or suburban parts of the urban continuum? Surprisingly, a link between tourism and suburbanisation is found in that tourism can be seen as one of the practices of city centres by people living in the suburbs. Because of the high real estate prices in the city centre and the transformation of the city centre into a commercial place, the only chance to practice centrality is as a tourist or as a consumer (Knafou 2007). Tourism can therefore be seen as exercising the right to centrality by people who can no longer afford to be residents in the central parts of the city.

For Lefebvre, the urban is “more or less the oeuvre of its citizens” (Lefebvre 1996, p. 117). I suggest to correct: Inhabited urban space can be seen as the oeuvre of its *inhabitants*! The production of urban space occurs through the practice of all people moving through the city, not only the residents. This ‘inhabitation of urban space’ (Butler 2011) is the issue when reflecting upon the multiple conflicting actors producing urban space. Especially public space—as place of the encounter of the Other, i.e., where otherness has to be accepted—is the very place where the city makes sense for tourists. It is a kind of space where the right to the city is exercised.

Inhabiting the city as exercising the right to mobility?

The value of mobility as a positive value of freedom of movement (Cresswell 2006) has to be examined because it legitimises the presence of mobile individuals as tourists in cities. There is a

PREPRINT: merci de citer d'après la version publiée: Stock, M. (2019). Inhabiting the city as tourist. Issues for urban and tourism theory. In: Frisch, T., Sommer, C., Stoltenberg, L. & Stors, N., *Tourism and Everyday life in the Contemporary City*, London, Routledge, pp.42-66

cosmopolitan discourse that sees the globalisation as global accessibilities and the integration of humankind through (tourism) mobilities. Freedom of movement means no barrier to mobilities and emplacement of people. Interestingly, Anthony Ince (2016) makes a plea for an anarchist theory of mobility in terms of 'autonomy', which is a translation of the question of individual competences and power. Autonomous mobilities in a globalised society, where passports are used reflexively to move, are indeed a 'capacity' informing the agency of the late-modern tourist, the reflexive and autonomous practice of places. The tourists undoubtedly have gained the power to inhabit the city and to exercise a right to the city through their capacity of being mobile.

Yet, the question of the right to mobility can also be specifically framed as legal framework of mobilities. These 'regimes of mobility' (Glick Schiller and Salazar 2013) show an ambiguous regulation of mobility. The spatial regime we observe nowadays could be labelled as contradictory and unequal, where mobility for some projects and some people is possible and for others not. Migration is today evaluated as problematic and heavily enforced. We observe a strengthening of national borders, whereas tourism is seen as a desirable mobility for economic and political stakeholders and for the tourists themselves. For instance, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the U.N. General Assembly in 1946, whose article 13 states the right for a citizen to freedom of movement within the borders, to leave and to return to his/her country. Within the European Union, residents are guaranteed the right to freely move within the EU's internal borders. The *European Parliament and Council Directive 2004/38/EC* of 29 April 2004 establishes migration and free choice of residency of EU citizens. UNWTO insists in its 'global code of ethics' a 'right to tourism' for everyone. Article 2 even coins the expression 'universal right to tourism' as corollary to the right to leisure of the human rights declaration. It links the social rights of free use of leisure time and reconstitution of the workforce through rest.

The conflicting rights to the city between residents and tourists seem therefore rooted in the right to mobility tourists have been granted and the power tourists have acquired to exercise their rights. The examination of the legal orders could be a step further in the political analysis of the right to the city exercised by temporary inhabitants.

Conclusion

The focus on the mobile inhabitants coping with the city through competences, spatial capital and legal resources is aimed at a better understanding of the contemporary processes in metropolises. The analysis of some of the limits of existing frameworks tried to raise awareness of the complex relationship between urban and touristic dimensions of human societies. It is finally meant to disrupt the routinised practice of developing urban theory without tourism, and tourism theory without the urban dimensions. Both are pervasive elements of contemporary societies. If urban theory and tourism theory are to meet, a more general framework would take into account not only the territorial form of cities, but also urbanisation processes in general, i.e., the accumulation and complexification of urbanity. An articulation of urban theory and tourism through the reworking of three concepts: Centrality, urbanity, urbanisation/de-urbanisation could be put forward. With respect to tourism, this would lead for example to the concepts of 'touristic urbanity' as expressed in resorts, 'touristic centrality' of places, 'urban values of tourism', elements that could be detected in every kind of place, including cities.

PREPRINT: merci de citer d'après la version publiée: Stock, M. (2019). Inhabiting the city as tourist. Issues for urban and tourism theory. In: Frisch, T., Sommer, C., Stoltenberg, L. & Stors, N., *Tourism and Everyday life in the Contemporary City*, London, Routledge, pp.42-66

Centrality as relational spatiality of social fields, especially in the context of globalisation allows for an understanding of 'global centralities' (Sassen 2001) and raises the question of 'touristic centralities' of cities, resorts, spots. If centrality is defined with reference to a specific 'social field', then there is an occasion to define relative centralities of places within a global tourism field. This would show the very importance of tourism as centralisation device in a global system of centralities. Moreover, the issue of symbolic centrality of cities (Monnet 2000) allows for the understanding why tourism is a powerful tool for contemporary cities. Centrality is not only an economic problem *per se*. As spatial arrangements are recognised by actors, and transformed into knowledge, its symbolic dimension is key for the understanding of the emergence and reproduction of centralities. It would lead to an understanding of tourism as co-constitutive of cities' and resorts' positioning in a global economy. It also would open up an understanding for tourist resorts as urban places, even without all of the features of cities such as density and heterogeneity. Although urban theories now acknowledge the city is not anymore the sole territorial form of urbanity (Amin and Thrift 2002), there is still a lack of theoretical integration of the multiple forms urbanity can take; resorts develop a specific touristic urbanity, which is important to recognise for the sake of theoretical coherence and empirical relevance.

Moreover, the concept of urbanity Lefebvre puts in the centre of his urban theory can be defined as specific quality of an urban place, based on public space, density, heterogeneity, centrality. Tourism modifies the urban qualities of places, especially in cities, but also in resorts. Tourists inhabit the city and therefore, through their practices, produce new urban qualities; especially public space is reconfigured through touristic practices. They contribute to the urbanity of the city by co-creating an inhabited space animated by mobile individuals (Sommer and Kip, this volume, Ch. 10). This framework approaches the different qualities of space—city or centre—as 'inhabited space', which is constructed by a large array of actors, including the day-to-day and tourist practices. As such, it provides the setting for situated actions. The increasing presence of mobile individuals, especially tourists, shapes contemporary urbanity. Tourism is co-constitutive of the contemporary metropolis; if it lacks a decrease in urbanity occurs.^{xxiv}

The question of urbanity also entails the classical sociological issue of the 'stranger' in the contemporary city because of new hospitality practices. Berliners go to Barcelona using Airbnb for sojourn, and Barcelonites go to Berlin using Airbnb, which transforms the classical opposition between immobile residents and mobile tourists as an essentialist qualification. The contemporary tourist is no stranger in the city any longer: He/She is an urbanite who moves from one city to another, with spatial, social, economic and cultural capital, and equipped with digital technologies. This is precisely the transformation of people considered as strangers into people considered as consumers in the tourism industry or as *alter ego* in the so-called sharing economy. The imaginary of digital peer-to-peer platforms such as Couchsurfing or Airbnb (www.airbnb.com) transform the stranger into a friend. The Airbnb slogan reads now 'belong anywhere' after being 'feel like a local'. This imaginary of hospitality and home is key to understand the changing inhabitation of the contemporary city. Inhabiting the city touristically can be framed as a practice of the city where routinised urban competences are simply transferred, which tames the confrontation with otherness.

Finally, Lefebvre's idea of urbanisation as a process of accumulation and complexification of urbanity contains the idea of 'planetary urbanisation', recently discussed by Brenner and Schmid (2014). He thinks in terms of urban revolution, triggered by industry, which leads to an explosion of the city and the reconfiguration of the urban at other scales. How to link tourism to this urbanisation problem? The model of the 'double urban revolution of tourism' (Stock and Lucas 2012) proposes a

PREPRINT: merci de citer d'après la version publiée: Stock, M. (2019). Inhabiting the city as tourist. Issues for urban and tourism theory. In: Frisch, T., Sommer, C., Stoltenberg, L. & Stors, N., *Tourism and Everyday life in the Contemporary City*, London, Routledge, pp.42-66

two-fold process: First, the emergence of tourist resorts for the last 200 years can be interpreted as a form of planetary urbanisation through tourism through a 'transfer of urbanity' from the cities to the resorts. This has occurred at the seaside, in the countryside and in the mountain areas all over the world. Secondly, the ongoing touristification of cities within a global tourism field from the 1970s onwards can also be interpreted as an urbanisation of the city. It takes seriously the idea of centralisation as an urban process, and allows for an understanding of the city as a process in constant reworking, where urbanisation and de-urbanisation processes occur.

It implies to define urbanisation as emergence and complexification of urbanity, which would apply for the understanding not only of the growth of cities, but also for the understanding of tourist resorts. In addition, we can conceive of ongoing urbanisation processes in tourist resorts since their inception. In Europe, many of the original resorts have been developing into cities, Cannes, Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Montreux being cases in point. Finally, if urbanisation means accumulating urbanity, then we also have to reflect upon de-urbanisation processes. For instance, British tourist resorts, which were highly prominent in the British tourist culture until the 1950s, exited the tourist economy, with resorts in the Mediterranean and South-East Asia replacing them (Shaw and Williams, 1997). Understanding the decline of resorts as de-urbanisation would point towards the process of replacement of tourist centralities by other kinds of centralities on the one hand, and the change of urbanity as replacement of touristic place-making by other forms of inhabitation on the other.

If we are to conceive of adequate frameworks for the urban in an urban, mobile, digital world where tourism is a pervasive element of the late-modern human societies, it is urgent to articulate urban theory and tourism theory.

Notes

ⁱ Exceptions are Mullins (1991) on 'tourism urbanisation', Soane (1993) on the urbanisation of resorts, Equipe MIT (2002, 2011) on the urbanity of resorts, Duhamel and Knafou (2007) on urban dimensions of tourism, Stock and Lucas (2012) on the 'double urban revolution of tourism', and Stock (2017) on 'touristic centrality' of resorts.

ⁱⁱ However, even Eurostat and UrbanAudit are unable to provide standardised and robust tourism statistics on cities. That makes Wöhler's attempt to provide his TourMIS database (www.tourmis.info) even more valuable. See also Freytag (2007) for a statistical effort on European cities.

ⁱⁱⁱ Glasgow in 1990, Lille in 2004, Liverpool in 2008, and Essen in 2010 as part of the Ruhr bid.

^{iv} Please refer also to the recent discussion on the 'regimes of value in tourism' in the special issue of the *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 2014, 12(3).

^v Airbnb (www.airbnb.com) as now the leading home sharing platform has profoundly changed the city economy. It began as a traditional sharing platform in 2010, but has now attracted mainly business activities, which municipalities try to regulate (Dredge *et al.* 2016, see also Stors, this volume, Ch. 6, Wildish and Spierings, this volume, Ch. 7).

^{vi} In the case of Berlin, the city estimates 4,7 million bednights in the so-called sharing economy and 33,2 million bednights with family and friends. However, no clue is offered to how it is estimated (Senat Berlin, 2018, p. 10-11).

^{vii} See Lévy (1999) for an approach of 'gradients of urbanity' ranging from the 'hyper-urban' in the metropolis to the 'infra-urban' in the countryside and Schmid (2006) for patterns of urbanity in Switzerland.

^{viii} The French original is: "Les urbains transportent l'urbain avec eux, même s'ils n'apportent pas l'urbanité" (Lefebvre 1968, p. 120).

^{ix} See Shields' (1991) contribution in his study on Brighton seen as placed at the social periphery of a cultural value system by Londoners.

^x I will use throughout the text the term 'urbanity' in order to designate the urban quality of place. Widely used since Lefebvre in French (*urbanité*) as a central element of urban theory, it is scarcely used in English. See however the work by Lévy (2014) as well as Brenner and Schmid (2014).

^{xi} French sociologist Juan Salvador (1997) reports the meaning of holiday for a middle-aged woman who says in an interview: "I just exchange sinks", which means she just continues doing all the housework in the same way on holiday as she does at home.

^{xii} See already de Certeau (1980) and Lahire (1998) for a thorough critique of the routinised practice theory and Elias (1995) for a critique of the notion of 'everyday life'.

PREPRINT: merci de citer d'après la version publiée: Stock, M. (2019). Inhabiting the city as tourist. Issues for urban and tourism theory. In: Frisch, T., Sommer, C., Stoltenberg, L. & Stors, N., *Tourism and Everyday life in the Contemporary City*, London, Routledge, pp.42-66

^{xiii} The following formulations are used by Heidegger in order to define 'dwelling': "the way the mortals are on the Earth" (the German original is "die Weise, wie die Sterblichen auf der Erde sind" (Heidegger 2004a, p. 142) and "relation of humans to places, and through places to spaces" (the German original is "Bezug des Menschen zu Orten und durch Orte zu Räumen" (Heidegger 2004a, p. 152).

^{xiv} See most importantly Seamon and Mugerauer (1985), Berque (1996) as well as Hoyaux (2001) for the pursuit of this endeavour. It has been an important research avenue in francophone geography for the last 20 years (Stock, 2004, 2006, Lazzarotti 2006, Paquot *et al.* 2007) and the special issues of the journals *Travaux de l'Institut de Géographie de Reims* (2003) and *Annales de Géographie* (2015).

^{xv} That is also the sense of the field of 'multilocality studies' where human beings inhabit several residences, but also a more or less complex system of places and mobilities (Rolshoven 2007, Stock 2009).

^{xvi} See Stock (2007a, 2007b) for a thorough critique of Heidegger's model of spatiality for lifeworlds informed by mobility and the development of a practice-based theory of dwelling.

^{xvii} This idea is based on the notion 'Lebensform' developed by Schütz (1973).

^{xviii} The French original is: "[E]nsemble des ressources, accumulées par un acteur, lui permettant de tirer avantage en fonction de sa stratégie, de l'usage de la dimension spatiale de la société" (Lévy 2003, 124).

^{xix} See for example Ingold (2000), for whom "skill, in short, is a property not of the individual human body as a biophysical entity, a thing-in-itself, but of the total field of relations constituted by the presence of the organism-person, indissolubly body and mind, in a richly structured environment" (Ingold, 2000: 291).

^{xx} See the notion 'épreuve' (test) as part of the 'pragmatic regimes' (Thévenot 2000).

^{xxi} See Violier (2016) who shows how tourists cope with different metro systems in New York, Moscow and Shanghai.

^{xxii} However, the second home market in metropolises has been an important vehicle and is accounted for 10% of the housing stock in Paris.

^{xxiii} I borrow from Lussault's (2009) French book title *De la lutte des classes à la lutte des places* which can be translated as "from class struggle to place struggle".

^{xxiv} Is it possible to imagine a city without tourists? The point made on New York by Lalia Rach (2003): "When the terrorism attacks occurred on September 11, 2001 the rhythm of travel was dramatically disrupted. Overnight, New York City experienced the unthinkable - hotels, stores, restaurants, attractions, museums, and convention centers echoed with silence. For an industry that thrives on movement, the sudden halt in travel created a zero sum reality (no visitors = no spending = no revenues = no taxes). Suddenly the City was without tourists, and there was a noticeable loss of vitality, power and pace. When added to the loss of economic stimulation, the City fully realized the importance of travelers to its continued wellbeing".

References

- Amin, A. and Thrift N., 2002. *Cities: Reimagining the Urban*. London: Polity Press.
- Antonescu A. and Stock M., 2014. Reconstruction of the globalisation of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 45 (1), 77–88.
- Ashworth G., 1989. Urban tourism: an imbalance in attention. *Progress in tourism, recreation and hospitality management*, 1 (1), 33–55.
- Ashworth G.J. and Tunbridge J., 1990. *The Tourist-historic City*. London: Belhaven Press.
- Ashworth G. and Page, S., 2011. Urban tourism research: Recent progress and current paradoxes. *Tourism Management*, 32 (1), 1–15.
- Berque A., 1996. *Être humains sur la Terre*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Bourdieu P., 1994. *Raisons pratiques. Sur la théorie de l'action*. Paris: Seuil.
- Bourdieu P., 2000. *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique*. Paris: Seuil.
- Brenner N. and Schmid C., 2014. The 'Urban Age' in Question. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38(3), 731–755.
- Butler R., 1980, The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: implication for management of resources. *Canadian Geographer*, 23(1), pp. 5-12.
- Butler C. 2007, Sydney: Aspiration, Asylum and the Denial of the Right to the City. In: Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos A. ed, *Law and the City*. Abingdon: Routledge-Cavendish, 205-220.
- Caillois R., 1958. *Les Jeux et les hommes: le masque et le vertige*. Paris: Gallimard (transl. as *Man, play, and games*. University of Illinois Press, 2001).
- Certeau, M. de, 1980. *L'invention du quotidien, I: Arts de faire*. Paris, Gallimard (transl. as *The practice of everyday life*, University of California Press, 1984).
- Colomb C. and Novy J., eds. 2017. *Protest and Resistance in the Tourist City*. London: Routledge.
- Crang M., 2002. Grounded Tourists, Travelling Theory. In: M. Crang & S. Coleman (ed.), *Tourism: Between Place and Performance*, Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1–17.
- Cresswell T., 2006. *On the Move. Mobility in the Modern Western World*, London: Routledge.
- Darbelay F. and Stock M., 2012. Tourism as complex interdisciplinary research object. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39 (1), 441–458.
- Dredge D., Gyimóthy S., Birkbak A., Jensen T. E. and Madsen A. K., 2016. *The impact of regulatory approaches targeting collaborative economy in the tourism accommodation sector: Barcelona, Berlin, Amsterdam and Paris*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Duhamel Ph. and Knafou R., eds. 2007. *Les mondes urbains du tourisme*. Paris: Belin.
- Edensor T., 2000. Staging Tourism. Tourists as Performers. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27 (2), 322–344.
- Elias N., 1986. Introduction. In: Elias N. and Dunning E., eds. *Quest for excitement. Sport and leisure in the civilising process*, Oxford: Blackwell, 19-62.
- Elias N., 1995. Sur le concept de vie quotidienne. *Cahiers internationaux de Sociologie*, 99 (2), 237–246.
- Enzensberger H.-M., 1958. Vergebliche Brandung der Ferne. Eine Theorie des Tourismus. *Merkur*, 12, 701–720. (transl. as A Theory of Tourism, *New German Critique*, 68, 117–135, 1996)
- Equipe MIT, 2002. *Tourismes 1. Lieux communs*. Paris: Belin
- Equipe MIT, 2011. *Tourismes 3. La révolution durable*. Paris: Belin
- Eurostat 2016, *Urban Europe. Statistics on cities, towns and suburbs*. Luxemburg: Publications office of the European Union (DOI: 10.2785/91120).
- Franklin A. & Crang M. 2001. The trouble with tourism and travel theory. *Tourist Studies*, 1 (1), 5–22.

- Freytag T., 2007. Städtetourismus in europäischen Großstädten. Eine Hierarchie der Standorte und aktuelle Entwicklungen der Übernachtungszahlen. *DisP, The Planning Review*, 43 (169), 56–67.
- Freytag T., 2010. Déjà-vu: tourist practices of repeat visitors in the city of Paris. *Social Geography*, 5 (1), 49–58.
- Füller H. and Michel B., 2014. ‘Stop Being a Tourist!’ New Dynamics of Urban Tourism in Berlin-Kreuzberg. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38 (4), 1304–1318.
- Glick Schiller N. and Salazar N., 2013. Regimes of mobility across the globe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration*, 39 (2), 183–200.
- Graburn N. 2002. The ethnographic tourist. In: Dann G., ed. *The tourist as a metaphor of the social world*, New York: CABI.
- Gravari-Barbas M. & Guinand S., 2017. *Tourism and Gentrification in Contemporary Metropolises. International Perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Hannam K., Sheller M. and Urry J., 2006. Editorial: Mobilities, Immobilities and Moorings. *Mobilities*, 1 (1), 1–22.
- Harvey D., 1985. *Consciousness and the Urban Experience. Studies in the History and Theory of Capitalist Urbanization I*. London: Blackwell.
- Harvey D., 2008, The right to the city, *New Left Review*, 53(5), 23-40
- Harvey D., 2001. *Spaces of capital. Towards a Critical Geography*. London: Routledge.
- Heidegger M., 2004a. ... dichterisch wohnet der Mensch.... In: Heidegger M., *Vorträge und Aufsätze*, Stuttgart, 181-198 (trans. as ...Poetically Man Dwells..., in *Poetry, Language, Thought*, New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1971).
- Heidegger M., 2004b. Bauen, Wohnen, Denken. In: Heidegger M., *Vorträge und Aufsätze*, Stuttgart, 139–156 (transl. as Building, Dwelling, Thinking, in *Basic Writings*, San Francisco: Harper Collins Publishers, 1977).
- Hennig Ch., 1999. *Reiselust*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Hoffman, L., Fainstein, S. and Judd, D., eds. 2003. *Cities and Visitors: Regulating People, Markets, and City Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hoyaux A.-F., 2002. Entre construction territoriale et constitution ontologique de l’habitant. Introduction épistémologique aux apports de la phénoménologie au concept d’habiter, *Cybergeo – European Journal of Geography* [online], n° 102. Available from <http://cybergeo.revues.org/1824> (Accessed 12 September 2018).
- Hölderlin F., 2008. In lieblicher Bläue. In: *Sämtliche Werke. Historisch-kritische Ausgabe*. 20 vol., Frankfurt: Stroemfeld.
- Ince A., 2016, Autonomy, Territory, Mobility: Everyday (Geo)Politics in Voluntary Exchange Networks, *Espace politique* [online], n° 28. Available from <https://espacepolitique.revues.org/3779> (accessed 12 September 2018).
- Jeuring J. and Haartsen T., 2016. The Challenge of Proximity: The (Un)Attractiveness of near-Home Tourism Destinations. *Tourism Geographies*, 16 (1), 118–141.
- Judd, D. and Fainstein, S., eds., 1999. *The Tourist City*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Kaufmann, V., Bergman, M. and D. Joye, 2004. Motility: Mobility as capital. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 28 (4), 745–756.
- Knafou R., 2007. L’urbain et le tourisme: une construction laborieuse. In: Duhamel Ph. and Knafou R., ed. *Mondes urbains du tourisme*. Paris: Belin, 9–21.
- Krippendorf J., 1977. *Die Landschaftsfresser*. Bern: Hallwag.
- Lahire B., 1998. *L’homme pluriel. Les ressorts de l’action*. Paris: Nathan.

- Larsen J., Urry J. and Axhausen K., 2007. Networks and tourism. Mobile social life. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34 (1), 244–262.
- Lazzarotti O., 2006. *Habiter. La condition géographique*. Paris: Belin.
- Lefebvre H., 1968. *Le droit à la ville*. Paris: Anthropos.
- Lefebvre H., 1996. *Writings on Cities*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell (translated and edited by Eleonore Kofman and Elizabeth Lebas).
- Lefebvre H., 2000. *La révolution urbaine*. Paris: Anthropos (1st edition 1970).
- Lévy J., 1999. *Le tournant géographique*. Paris: Belin.
- Lévy J., 2003. Capital spatial. In: Lévy J. and Lussault M., eds. *Dictionnaire de la géographie et de l'espace des sociétés*, Paris: Belin, 124–125.
- Lévy J., 2014. Science + Space + Society: Urbanity and the Risk of Methodological Communalism in Social Sciences of Space. *Geographica Helvetica*, 69 (1), 99–114.
- Löfgren O., 1999. *On Holiday, A History of Vacationing*, Berkeley: University of California Press
- Lucas L., 2018. Le parcours des touristes à Los Angeles. Entre optimisation des déplacements et compétences spatiales. *Teoros*, 37 (1) [online], available from <https://journals.openedition.org/teoros/3246> (accessed 4 October 2018).
- Lussault M., 2009. *De la lutte des classes à la lutte des places*. Paris: Grasset.
- Lussault M., 2007. *L'Homme spatial*. Paris: Seuil.
- Lussault M. and Stock M., 2010. “Doing with space”. Towards a pragmatics of space. *Social Geography* [online], 5 (1), 1–8. Available from <http://www.soc-geogr.net/5/11/2010/sg-5-11-2010.pdf> (accessed 12 September /2018).
- MacCannell, D., 1976. *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Monnet J., 2000. Les dimensions symboliques de la centralité. *Cahiers de géographie du Québec*, 123, 399–418.
- Mullins, P., 1991. Tourism urbanization. *International Journal of urban and regional research*, 15 (3), 326–342.
- Novy, J. and Colomb, C., 2012. Struggling for the Right to the (Creative) City in Berlin and Hamburg: New urban Social Movement, New Spaces of Hope? *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 34 (2), 1816–1838.
- Obrador Pons P., 2003. Being-on-holiday: Tourist Dwelling, Bodies and Place. *Tourist Studies*, 3(1), 47–66.
- Paquot T., Lussault M. and Younès Ch., eds. *Habiter, le propre de l'humain*. Paris: La Découverte.
- Pott A., 2007. *Tourismusorte. Eine gesellschafts- und raumtheoretische Untersuchung am Beispiel des Städtetourismus*. Bielefeld: Transcript.
- Pratt A. and Hutton T., 2013. Reconceptualising the relationship between the creative economy and the city. Learning from the financial crisis. *Cities*, 33 (1), 86–95.
- Rach L., 2003. Rebuilding Tourism in an Uncertain Environment [online]. A White Paper prepared for the Sister City Summit. Available from: http://www.nyc.gov/html/ia/gp/downloads/pdf/rebuilding_tourism_paper.pdf [Accessed 27 September 2018].
- Reckwitz A., 2002. Toward a Theory of Social Practices: A Development in Culturalist Theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5 (2), 243–263
- Rolshoven J., 2007. Multilokalität als Lebensweise in der Spätmoderne. *Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunde*, 103, 157–179.
- Salomon-Cavin J. and Marchand B., 2011. *Anti-urbain. Origines et conséquences de l'urbaphobie*. Lausanne: Presses Polytechniques et Universitaires Romandes.
- Salvador J., Largo-Poirier A., Orain H. and Poltorak J.-F., 1997. *Les sentiers du quotidien. Rigidité,*

- fluidité des espaces sociaux et trajets routiniers en ville*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Sassen S., 1991. *The global city: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton, Princeton University Press
- Schatzki T., Knorr-Cetina, K. and Savigny, E. von, eds., 2001. *The practice turn in contemporary theory*. London: Routledge.
- Schmid, C., 2006. Theory. In: R. Diener, J. Herzog, M. Meili, P. de Meuron and C. Schmid, *Switzerland: an urban portrait, Volume 1*, Basel: Birkhäuser, 163–221.
- Schütz A., 1973. *Der sinnhafte Aufbau der sozialen Welt*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Scott A., 2004. Cultural-products industries and urban economic development. Prospects for Growth and Market Contestation in Global Context. *Urban Affairs Review*, 39 (4), 461-490.
- Seamon, D. and Mugerauer, R., 1985. *Dwelling, place and environment. Towards a Phenomenology of Person and World*. Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Shaw G. and Williams A., eds., 1997. *The Rise and Fall of British Coastal Resorts: Cultural and Economies Perspectives*. London: Cassell.
- Sheller M. and Urry J., 2006. The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning A*, 38 (2), 207–226.
- Shields R., 1991. *Places on the Margin. Alternative Geographies of Modernity*. London: Routledge.
- Soane J., 1993. *Fashionable Resort Regions. Their Evolution and Transformation With Particular Reference to Bournemouth, Nice, Los Angeles and Wiesbaden*. Wallingford: CABI.
- Spode H., 2016. Mobilität, Reisen, Tourismus. Transformationen der Terminologie zwischen Fremdenverkehrslehre und Mobility Turn. In: Pechlahner H. and Volgger M., ed. *Die Gesellschaft auf Reisen – Eine Reise in die Gesellschaft*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag, 23–46.
- Spode H., 2009. Tourism Research and Theory in German-Speaking Countries. In: Dann, G. and Liebman-Parrinello, G., eds. *The Sociology of Tourism*. Bingley: Emerald, 65–94.
- Stephen L., 1871. *The playground of Europe*. London: Longmans, Green & Co.
- Stock M., 2004. L'habiter comme pratique des lieux géographiques », *Espacestems.net* [online], available from <https://www.espacestems.net/articles/habiter-comme-pratique-des-lieux-geographiques/> (Accessed 17 July 2018).
- Stock M., 2006. L'hypothèse de l'habiter polytopique. *Espacestems.net* [online], available from <https://www.espacestems.net/articles/hypothese-habiter-polytopique/> (Accessed 17 July 2018).
- Stock M., 2007a. Mobility as 'arts of dwelling': conceptual investigations. Paper at the American Association of Geographers. San Francisco, available from <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00366452/document> (Accessed 17 July 2018).
- Stock M., 2007b. Théorie de l'habiter. Questionnements. In: Paquot T., Lussault M. and Younès Ch., eds. *Habiter, le propre de l'humain*. Paris: La Découverte, 103–125.
- Stock M., 2007c. Towards a recreational turn of European Cities? *Hagar. Studies in Culture, Polity and Identities*, 7 (1), 115–134.
- Stock M., 2009. Polytopisches Wohnen. Ein phänomenologisch-prozessorientierter Zugang. [Informationen zur Raumforschung](#), n° 1-2, 107–116.
- Stock M. and Lucas L., 2012. La double révolution urbaine du tourisme. *Espaces & Sociétés*, 151, 15–30.
- Stock M., 2014. 'Touristisch wohnt der Mensch'. Zu einer kulturwissenschaftlichen Theorie mobiler Lebensweisen. *Voyage*, n°16, 54–68.
- Stock M., 2015. Habiter comme 'faire avec l'espace'. Réflexions à partir des théories de la pratique. *Annales de Géographie*, n°704, 424–441.
- Senat Berlin, 2018. Konzept für einen stadtverträglichen und nachhaltigen Berlin-Tourismus 2018+. Berlin: Senat Berlin (https://www.berlin.de/sen/web/presse/aktuelles-presseschau/tourismuskonzept_1senatsbefassung.pdf) (Accessed 17 July 2018).

- Thévenot L., 2000. Pragmatic regimes governing the engagement with the world. *In*: Schatzki T., Knorr-Cetina K. & Savigny E. von, eds. *The practice turn in contemporary theory*. London: Routledge.
- UNWTO, 2012. *Global report on city tourism – Cities 2012 Project*. Madrid: UNWTO.
- UNWTO 2016. *Compendium of tourism statistics. Data 2010-2014*, Madrid: UNWTO.
- Urbain J.-D., 1991. *L'Idiot du voyage. Histoires de touristes*. Paris: Plon.
- Violier P., 2016. Mobilité des individus et familiarité construite: des arrangements qui offrent aux touristes des prises pour parcourir le monde, *Mondes du tourisme* [online], n° 12, Available from <http://journals.openedition.org/tourisme/1365> (Accessed 17 July 2018).
- Williams A. and Shaw G., 2004, *Tourism and Tourism Spaces*. London: Sage.